



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/489,596	01/20/2000	Todd R. Collart	IACTP018	6028
22242	7590	12/29/2005	EXAMINER	
FITCH EVEN TABIN AND FLANNERY 120 SOUTH LA SALLE STREET SUITE 1600 CHICAGO, IL 60603-3406			MA, JOHNNY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2617	

DATE MAILED: 12/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/489,596	COLLART ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Johnny Ma	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 21-34 and 36-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 21-34 and 36-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)              |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>(5) 10/05-11/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.  |

**DETAILED ACTION*****Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 31-36 and 45-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Applicant's arguments filed 8/30/2005 have previously been fully considered but they are not persuasive as discussed in the previous Advisory Action. Furthermore, it is noted that Applicant has not presented new arguments since the Advisory Action was mailed. Therefore, the relevant response to arguments previously discussed follows.

Applicant further argues “[f]urthermore, the office action has equated the claimed ‘keyword’ and the separately claimed ‘first code’ as both being equal to ‘search terms’ described in Dodson et al. By equating the ‘first code’ to being equivalent to a ‘keyword’ the office action has effectively read the limitation out of the claim.” The examiner respectfully disagrees. The relevant portion of the claim reads “receiving a keyword and a first code associated with the video image over a second communication channel.” It is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., a special definition of first code that precludes a keyword) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). As discussed in the previous Office Action, the keyword and first code were met by different keywords available for search. Furthermore, the claimed “associated with predefined information relating to the keyword” was met by “wherein a single automatic search term serving as a keyword, and one of remaining automatic search terms serving as a first code in that it is related to the keyword since they characterize the same

programming.” Further note, the predefined information was met by “the automatic search terms are used to perform a search that returns results, the search results associated with the first code, wherein the results are inherently information that is predefined since it would be impossible for a search to pull up such information if the information was not already defined.” In view of the discussion above, the Examiner respectfully disagrees that “that ‘first code’ cannot be equated to a ‘search term’ because this is not a ‘search term’ but instead a code that is specifically associated with predefined content.” The claimed first code has not been claimed in a manner that would preclude a search term.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 21-23, 26-28, and 45-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodson et al. (US 6,184,877 B1 of record) in further view of Herrington et al. (US 6,865,746 B1 of record).

As to claim 21, note the Dodson et al. reference that discloses a system and method for interactively accessing program information on a television. The claimed “receiving content comprising a video image over a first channel” is met by a television being turned on to receive a television channel that displays television programming (Dodson 3:59-64). The claimed “receiving a keyword associated with the video image over a second channel” is met by automatic search terms to be searched may be obtained through a program guide database directly accessible at the cable company’s location by

using such devices as an internet interface or telephone line (Dodson 3:7-28). The claimed “and a first code” and “wherein the first code is associated with predefined information relating to the keyword” is met by “automatic search terms to be searched, such as the movie title, actors, and the director” (Dodson 3:9-12) wherein a single automatic search term serving as a keyword, and one of remaining automatic search terms serving as a first code in that it is related to the keyword since they characterize the same programming, and facilitates a search. Also note, that the automatic search terms are used to perform a search that returns results, the search results associated with the first code, wherein the results are inherently information that is predefined since it would be impossible for the search to pull up such information if the information was not already defined. The claimed “requesting a search of a network for information relating to the keyword” is met by search query is sent to the Internet (Dodson 4:28-34). The claimed “receiving the information including the predefined information relating to the keyword” is met by “[i]f the user elects to begin search, a new overlay 400 appears over the program. The overlay 400 includes a list of hits based on the search terms...the user may select one of the hits to view the text associated with the hit” (Dodson 3:41-49), also note the hits returned inherently include predefined information as discussed above. Also note, the Dodson et al. reference discloses “a method according to the present invention for saving [bookmarking] the results of an Internet search which can be initiated for search terms which are automatically generated” (Dodson 5:11-34). However, the Dodson et al. reference is silent as to bookmarking the keyword and a first code associated with predefined information relating to the keyword. Now note the Herrington et al. reference that discloses “[t]he system may provide the user with an opportunity to

save search parameters for use at a later time" (Herrington 1:67-2:2). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dodson keyword search linked to the Internet with the Herrington et al. saving of search parameters (bookmarking) for the purpose for allowing interested users to access additional information at a more convenient time if they prefer not to interrupt currently displayed content and to provide updated search results that reflect the information available at the later time when the search is performed. The claimed "bookmarking the keyword" is met by the Dodson et al. and Herrington et al. combination as set forth above.

As to claim 22, the claimed "displaying the video image" is met by the display of programming on a TV display (column 2, lines 47-64). The claimed "displaying the keyword" is met by the display of automatic search terms associated with the television program (column 3, lines 7-28).

As to claim 23, please see rejection of claim 21.

As to claim 26, the claimed "further comprising receiving a second code that is a category code included with the keyword" is met by the receipt of program guide information used to generate automatic search terms (Dodson 3:8-25) wherein the automatic search terms may include categories (category code) (Dodson 4:56-59). The claimed "wherein the category code assists in the searching of the network for information relating to the keyword" is met by using category information to assist in the search in order "to limit the number of hits to a reasonable number. The categories can also be generated as an automatic search term, assuming the program guide provider has identified the programs into categories" (Dodson 4:52-59).

As to claim 27, note the Dodson et al. reference discloses receiving video programming over a broadcast channel and epg information via an Internet interface. However, the Dodson et al. reference is silent as to the specific transmission media used for Internet communications. Nevertheless, the examiner submits that it is notoriously well known in the art to transmit epg information on a broadcast medium for the purpose of making electronic program guide information readily accessible to a user without requiring the use of a separate communication medium. Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dodson et al. epg access accordingly for the above stated

As to claim 28, the claimed “further comprising the step of displaying the video image” is met by the display of programming on a TV display (column 2, lines 47-64).

As to claim 45, note the Dodson et al. reference that discloses a system and method for interactively accessing program information on a television. The claimed “receiving content comprising a video image over a first channel” is met by a television being turned on to receive a television channel that displays television programming (column 3, lines 59-64). The claimed “receiving a keyword associated with the video image over a second channel” is met by automatic search terms to be searched may be obtained through a program guide database directly accessible at the cable company’s location by using such devices as an internet interface or telephone line (column 3, lines 7-28) for an Internet search query. The claimed “wherein the keyword comprises a first code” is met by “automatic search terms to be searched, such as the movie title, actors, and the director” (Dodson 3:9-12) wherein a single automatic search term serves as a keyword comprising a first code (search term). The claimed “receiving a second code

relating to the keyword over the second communication channel” is met by using category information to assist in the search in order “to limit the number of hits to a reasonable number. The categories can also be generated as an automatic search term, assuming the program guide provider has identified the programs into categories” (Dodson 4:52-59) wherein the program guide information is received from a different channel as the content as discussed above. The claimed “initiating a search based on the keyword and the second code; receiving information relating to the keyword and the second code” is met by a search query is sent to the Internet (Dodson 4:28-34) and the results requested form the Internet received for display including result limited by the second code (category code) (Dodson 4:28-41,52-59). However, the Dodson et al. reference does not specifically disclose “logging the search; and initiating a subsequent search based on the logged search.” Now note the Herrington et al. reference that discloses “[t]he system may provide the user with an opportunity to save search parameters for use at a later time” (Herrington 1:67-2:2) wherein the saved search parameters may be used to initiate a subsequent search (Herrington 2:2-13). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dodson keyword search linked to the Internet with the Herrington et al. saving of search parameters (bookmarking) for the purpose for allowing interested users to access additional information at a more convenient time if they prefer not to interrupt currently displayed content and to provide updated search results that reflect the information available at a later time when the search is repeated.

As to claim 46, please see rejection of claim 45.

5. Claims 24, 29-30, 37, 39-41, and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodson et al. (US 6,184,877 B1 of record) in further view of Herrington et al. (US 6,865,746 B1) and Portuesi (US 6,499,057 of record).

As to claim 24, the claimed further comprising the step of displaying the keyword associated with the video image in response to a selection of the video image. The Dodson et al. (US 6,184,877 B1) reference discloses a method for interactively accessing program information on a television, the method comprising receiving a search request regarding a television program; displaying at least one search term overlaid on a program being received by the television; searching the Internet for requested information; obtaining a result of the search; and saving the result in a memory coupled with the television (column 1, lines 63-67; column 2; lines 1-3). The Dodson et al. reference provides an overlay for a user to select automatic search terms that may be derived in various ways as well as add additional search terms (column 3, lines 8-40). However, the Dodson et al. reference does not disclose displaying the keyword embedded in the video image in response to a selection of the video image. The Portuesi reference discloses display window 28 can include a caption 34 which provides a description of the area within display window 28 over which a pointing device, such as a mouse pointer, is positioned. For example, if the pointing device is positioned over hypertext link 22, caption 34 can provide a name for link 32 or provide the actual URL (Portuesi 6:22-27). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dodson et al. method of viewing keywords with the Portuesi display of keywords when a portion of an image is selected for the purpose of making keywords readily available to the user in addition to

providing a more intuitive method of indicating the keyword for an associated item of interest.

As to claim 29, the claimed further comprising the step of selecting the video image. See rejection of claim 24.

As to claim 30, the claimed further comprising the step of displaying the keyword in response to the selecting of the video image. See rejection of claim 24.

As to claim 37, note the Dodson et al. reference that discloses a system and method for interactively accessing program information on a television. The claimed “displaying a video image that was received over a first channel” is met by the display of programming received on a currently tuned channel (column 3, lines 57-67). The claimed “receiving a keyword and a first code over a second channel” is met by automatic search terms to be searched may be obtained through a program guide database directly accessible at the cable company’s location by using such devices as an internet interface or telephone line (column 3, lines 7-28) and the receipt of category search terms (a first code) (Dodson 4:52-59). The claimed “wherein the first code is associated with predefined information relating to the keyword” is met by the category first code wherein the automatic search terms are used to perform a search that returns results, the search results associated with the first code, wherein the results are inherently information that is predefined since it would be impossible for the search to pull up such information if the information was not already defined. Also note, that the automatic search terms are used to perform a search that returns results, the search results associated with the first code, wherein the results are inherently information that is predefined since it would be impossible for the search to pull up such information if the information was not already

defined.. However, the Dodson et al. reference does not disclose selecting a portion of a video image and or; and sending over the network the keyword associated with the portion of the video image in response to the selecting of the portion of the video image. The Portuesi reference discloses display window 28 can include a caption 34 which provides a description of the area within display window 28 over which a pointing device, such as a mouse pointer, is positioned. For example, if the pointing device is positioned over hypertext link 22, caption 34 can provide a name for link 32 or provide the actual URL (Portuesi 6:22-27). “In response to activation by the user, the embedded uniform network resource locator is followed to retrieve a resource addressed by the embedded uniform network resource locator” (Portuesi 2:52-55). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dodson et al. keyword display with the Portuesi display window and caption for the purpose of providing a method of making keywords more readily available to the viewer in addition to a more intuitive method of identifying keywords associated with a desired object. Also note, the Dodson et al. reference discloses “a method according to the present invention for saving [bookmarking] the results of an Internet search which can be initiated for search terms which are automatically generated” (Dodson 5:11-34). However, the Dodson et al. reference is silent as to bookmarking the keyword. Now note the Herrington et al. reference that discloses “[t]he system may provide the user with an opportunity to save search parameters for use at a later time” (Herrington 1:67-2:2). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dodson keyword search linked to the Internet with the

Herrington et al. saving of search parameters (bookmarking) for the purpose for allowing interested users to access additional information at a more convenient time if they prefer not to interrupt currently displayed content and to provide updated search results that reflect the information available at the later time when the search is performed. The claimed “bookmarking the keyword” is met by the Dodson et al. and Herrington et al. combination as set forth above. Further note the Dodson et al. reference discloses a method for interactively accessing program information on a television, the method comprising receiving a search request regarding a television program; displaying at least one search term overlaid on a program being received by the television; searching the Internet for requested information; obtaining a result of the search; and saving the result in a memory coupled with the television (column 1, lines 63-67; column 2; lines 1-3). The claimed “sending over a network the keyword associated with the portion of the video image in response to the selecting of the portion of the video image” is met by the Dodson and Portuesi, combination as set forth above wherein the Dodson searching [sending a keyword over a network] is performed when a selects a portion of the video image corresponding to a keyword.

As to claim 38, the claimed “wherein the keyword further includes a second code comprising a classification code” is met by the category code as discussed in the rejection of claim 37.

As to claim 39, the claimed further comprising the step of displaying the keyword associated with the portion of the video image in response to the selecting of the portion of the video image. The Dodson et al. (US 6,184,877 B1) reference discloses a method for interactively accessing program information on a television, the method comprising

receiving a search request regarding a television program; displaying at least one search term overlaid on a program being received by the television; searching the Internet for requested information; obtaining a result of the search; and saving the result in a memory coupled with the television (column 1, lines 63-67; column 2; lines 1-3). The Dodson et al. reference provides an overlay for a user to select automatic search terms that may be derived in various ways as well as add additional search terms (column 3, lines 8-40). However, the Dodson et al. reference does not disclose displaying the keyword embedded in the video image in response to a selection of the video image. The Portuesi reference discloses display window 28 can include a caption 34 which provides a description of the area within display window 28 over which a pointing device, such as a mouse pointer, is positioned. For example, if the pointing device is positioned over hypertext link 22, caption 34 can provide a name for link 32 or provide the actual URL (Portuesi 6:22-27). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dodson et al. method of viewing keywords with the Portuesi display of keywords when a portion of an image is selected for the purpose of making keywords readily available to the user in addition to providing a more intuitive method of indicating the keyword for an associated item of interest.

As to claim 40, the claimed “wherein the keyword is embedded in the video image” is met by the Dodson et al. and Portuesi combination wherein the embedding of the keyword in the video image is inherent to the successful display of keywords by selection of a portion of the video image, see rejection of claim 37.

As to claim 41, the claimed “further comprising the step of receiving over the network information relating to the keyword” is met by the obtaining of internet query search results for display to a user (column 4, lines 52-65).

As to claim 43, the claimed “wherein the keyword is embedded in the video image” is met by the Dodson et al. and Portuesi combination wherein the embedding of the keyword in the video image is inherent to the successful display of keywords by selection of a portion of the video image, see rejection of claim 37.

As to claim 44, the claimed “further comprising the step of searching a network for information relating to the keyword” is met by the Dodson et al. internet search query (column 4, lines 52-59).

6. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodson et al. (US 6,184,877 B1 of record) in further view of Herrington et al. (US 6,865,746 B1) and Farber et al. (US 5,819,284 of record).

As to claim 25, the claimed wherein the received information relating to the keyword is based up a user profile. The Dodson et al. reference discloses search results are conveyed to a user wherein the query may be limited to a program category, such as sports or movies, to limit the number of hits to a reasonable number (column 4, lines 52-65). However, the Dodson et al. reference does not disclose the use of a user profile.

The Farber et al. reference discloses user profile database 174 contains information for each user of the system, specifying (a) the categories or types of information services that are to be provided to that user, and (b) for those information services, the parameters that are associated with the desired information. For example, a first user may desire traffic, financial and sports information, a second user may desire weather and news information,

and a third user may desire traffic, news and weather. For each of these three users, the detailed information desired may be different. Thus, the first user may desire traffic information for certain roadways, financial information for certain securities, and sports information for particular teams (Farber et al. 4:43-55). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dodson et al. keyword search with the Farber et al. profile database for the purpose of providing targeted information to the user that are directed towards his/her preferences.

7. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodson et al. (US 6,184,877 B1 of record) in further view of Portuesi (US 6,499,057 of record), Herrington et al. (US 6,865,746 B1), and Farber et al. (US 5,819,284 of record).

As to claim 42, note the Dodson et al. reference discloses the obtaining of an internet search query for display to a user (column 4, lines 52-65). However, the Dodson et al. reference does not disclose the use of a user profile. The Farber et al. reference discloses user profile database 174 contains information for each user of the system, specifying (a) the categories or types of information services that are to be provided to that user, and (b) for those information services, the parameters that are associated with the desired information. For example, a first user may desire traffic, financial and sports information, a second user may desire weather and news information, and a third user may desire traffic, news and weather. For each of these three users, the detailed information desired may be different. Thus, the first user may desire traffic information for certain roadways, financial information for certain securities, and sports information for particular teams (Farber et al. 4:43-55). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dodson et al. keyword search with the Portuesi hot spots and the Farber et al. profile database for the purpose of providing targeted information to the user that are directed towards his/her preferences.

8. Claims 31-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodson et al. (US 6,184,877 B1 of record) in further view of Feinleib (US 2004/0040042 A1 of record), Kaiser et al. (US 6,615,408 B1 of record), and Portuesi (US 6,499,057 of record).

As to claim 31, note the Dodson et al. reference that discloses a system and method for interactively accessing program information on a television. The Dodson et al. reference also discloses displaying a video image that was received over a first channel is met by the display of programming received on a currently tuned channel (column 3, lines 57-67). However, the Dodson et al. reference does not specifically disclose wherein the video image is displayed from a local storage medium. Now note the Feinleib reference that recognizes the advantage of providing supplemental information associated with keywords from recorded programming (Feinleib [0079]) wherein the associated keyword information is stored locally (Feinleib [0012, 0083], also see Key Phrase Data File 62 as illustrated in Figure 2). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dodson et al. keyword search during a live broadcast with the Feinleib keyword search during playback of a recorded program for the purpose of providing the benefits of obtaining additional information through keywords when the user has elected to record programming and view the programming at a later time.

The Dodson et al. reference also teaches “receiving keywords [...] associated with the video image over a second channel” wherein automatic search terms to be searched may be obtained through a program guide database directly accessible at the cable company’s location by using such devices as an internet interface or telephone line (Dodson 3:7-28) and search term (keyword) includes title information as illustrated in Figure 3 (Dodson). Further note, the Feinleib reference discloses “[t]he enhancing content can be supplied to the clients 22(1)-22(M) over the broadcast networks 24, 32, or over the data network 28 from the content server 22(1)-22(K)...As an alternative, the enhancing content might reside on a storage medium at the viewer’s home, such as on a computer disk or a CD-ROM, which can be accessed during the playing of the primary content. However, the Dodson et al. and Feinleib combination does not specifically teach “keywords comprising a unique identifier of the storage medium and a title. Now note the Kaiser et al. reference that discloses a method, system, and apparatus for providing action selections to an image referencing product in a video production. The claimed “a unique identifier of the storage medium and a title” is met by “[a] trigger comprises a resource identifier. In the illustrative embodiment, the resource identifier is a Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) of the form: http://<server name>/<videoprod>/<position>..., <server name> may be any server addressable on the data network 1400” (Kaiser 6:35-64). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dodson et al. and Feinleib combination teaching Dodson et al. and Feinleib combination wherein the keyword identifies the title of the program stored in local storage with the Kaiser et al. Resource identifier comprising a <server name> (unique storage identifier) and <videoprod> (title) for the purpose

indicating the location of the supplemental content to the set top box to facilitate accurate retrieval. However, the Dodson et al. reference does not disclose selecting a portion of a video image and displaying a keyword associated with the portion of the video image in response to the selecting of the portion of the video image. The Portuesi reference discloses display window 28 can include a caption 34 which provides a description of the area within display window 28 over which a pointing device, such as a mouse pointer, is positioned. For example, if the pointing device is positioned over hypertext link 22, caption 34 can provide a name for link 32 or provide the actual URL (Portuesi 6:22-27). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dodson et al. keyword display with the Portuesi display window and caption for the purpose of providing a method of making keywords more readily available to the viewer in addition to a more intuitive method of identifying keywords associated with a desired object. The claimed “embedding the keyword in the video image” is met by the Dodson et al. and Portuesi combination wherein the embedding of the keyword in the video image is inherent to the successful display of keywords by selection of a portion of the video image.

As to claim 32, the claimed “sending the keyword over a network” is met by the derivation of automatic search terms by access to a program guide database via an internet interface (column 3, lines 8-28).

As to claim 33, the claimed “further comprising the step of receiving over the network information relating to the keyword” is met by user receiving the results of an Internet search query (column 4, lines 52-65).

As to claim 34, the claimed “further comprising the step of searching a network for information relating to the keyword” is met by a query being sent to the Internet for a search (column 4, lines 52-65).

9. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodson et al. (US 6,184,877 B1 of record) in further view of Feinleib (US 2004/0040042 A1 of record), Kaiser et al. (US 6,615,408 B1 of record), Portuesi (US 6,499,057 of record), and Farber et al. (US 5,819,284 of record).

As to claim 36, the claimed “sending the keyword over a network” is met by the automatic search terms being derived from a program guide database wherein the program guide database is accessed via an internet interface (column 3, lines 8-28). The claimed “receiving over the network information relating to the keyword” is met by the obtaining of an internet search query for display to a user (column 4, lines 52-65).

However, the Dodson et al. reference does not disclose the use of a user profile. The Farber et al. reference discloses user profile database 174 contains information for each user of the system, specifying (a) the categories or types of information services that are to be provided to that user, and (b) for those information services, the parameters that are associated with the desired information. For example, a first user may desire traffic, financial and sports information, a second user may desire weather and news information, and a third user may desire traffic, news and weather. For each of these three users, the detailed information desired may be different. Thus, the first user may desire traffic information for certain roadways, financial information for certain securities, and sports information for particular teams (Farber et al. 4:43-55). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to modify the Dodson et al. keyword search with the Portuesi hot spots and the Farber et al. profile database for the purpose of providing targeted information to the user that are directed towards his/her preferences.

10. Claims 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dodson et al. (US 6,184,877 B1 of record) in further view of Herrington et al. (US 6,865,746 B1) and Goldschmidt Iki et al. (US 2001/0005903 A1 of record).

As to claim 47, the claimed “second code comprises a classification” is met by that discussed in the rejection of claim 45 wherein the second code comprises a category. Also note the Dodson et al. reference discloses a first code in the form of search terms derived from the program guide as discussed in the rejection of claim 45. However, the Dodson et al. reference is silent as to a numerical tag. Now note the Goldschmidt Iki et al. reference that discloses searches based on a episode number (numerical tag) contained in the EPG (Goldschmidt [0038]). Therefore, the examiner submits that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Dodson et al. search term (first code) generated from the program guide with the Goldschmidt Iki et al. episode number for the purpose of further limiting the results of a search to information more closely tailored to a specific episode of programming viewed.

### *Conclusion*

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The Park et al. reference (US 6,460,180 B1) discloses “[b]rowser software 915, may, for example, receive a trigger from trigger filter block 916, extract a Uniform

Resource Identifier (URI) from the trigger, access the Internet via modem 915 to retrieve web content identified by the URI, merge the retrieved web content and television video together, and then drive the video encoder 907 and audio digital-to-analog converter 906 so that the merged content is displayed on a screen of a television in a fashion determined by the trigger. The URI in this example may be a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) that locates an information resource on the World Wide Web. In an alternate embodiment, the URI can access a file stored locally that includes the web content" (Park 8:17-29).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Johnny Ma whose telephone number is (571) 272-7351. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jm

  
CHRIS KELLEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600